



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,182	03/31/2004	Ralph E. Wesinger JR.	NES-014COC	7869
28661	7590	12/11/2006	EXAMINER	
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD. 1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202 Minden, NV 89423			AHN, SANGWOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,182	Applicant(s) WESINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Sangwoo Ahn	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:02162005,05122005,05312005,08162005,01272006,07132006.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 – 24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 24 of copending Application No. 10816224. The following table shows the claims in '182 that are rejected by corresponding claims in '224.

'182	'224
1 – 8	1 – 8
9 – 16	9 – 16
17 – 24	17 – 24

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because “a password” in ‘182 is analogous to “a user ID” in ‘224, since they both serve, individually or cooperatively, as parameters to achieve authorization or authentication.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 9, and 17, and their dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1, 9, and 17 recite the following limitations that are not described in the specification:

- “receiving a request from a user for a password”
- “querying said user for an email address”
- “associating a password with said user responsive to a received email address”
- “sending said password to said email address”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9 and 17, and their dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 9, for a system or an apparatus or a machine to be a physical object, at least one recited element must be hardware. If all elements would have been reasonably interpreted in light of the disclosure by one of ordinary skill as software alone, the claim is directed to software *per se* and is non-statutory.

Claim 17 is rejected based on the same rationale discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,436,972 issued to Addison M. Fischer (hereinafter “Fischer”).

Regarding claim 1, Fischer discloses,

Art Unit: 2166

A method for facilitating a web site password verification comprising:
receiving a request from a user for a password (column 3 lines 7 – 11, et seq.);
querying said user for an email address (column 10 lines 54 – 59, column 11 lines 6 – 8, et seq.);
associating a password with said user responsive to a received email address (column 11 lines 34 – 36; 43 – 44, et seq.); and
sending said password to said email address (column 11 lines 15 – 16; 62 – 63, column 12 lines 55 – 57, et seq.).

Regarding claim 2, Fischer discloses,
said act of querying said user comprises presenting to the user a page containing an area for entering at least one email address and an icon for invoking a password be sent to the associated email address (Figures 1, 3 and 4, et seq.).

Regarding claim 3, Fischer discloses,
said verification is initiated by clicking on said icon by the user (Figures 1, 3 and 4, et seq.).

Regarding claim 4, Fischer discloses,
said email contains customer information corresponding to said password (column 6 lines 46 – 49, et seq.).

Regarding claim 5, Fischer discloses,
said email is logged in a database file (column 5 lines 7 – 9, et seq.).

Regarding claim 6, Fischer discloses,

Art Unit: 2166

said received request is logged in a database file (column 5 lines 7 – 9, column 6 lines 46 – 51, et seq.).

Regarding claim 7, Fischer discloses,

said email contains a link to said website (Figure 2, column 4 lines 15 – 16: “secret information”, “user information” or “escrow information” could contain all kinds of information as described in Figure 2 and various sections of the disclosure, et seq.).

Regarding claim 8, Fischer discloses,

clicking said link takes the user to said website (Figure 2, column 4 lines 15 – 16, “secret information”, “user information” or “escrow information” could contain all kinds of information as described in Figure 2 and various sections of the disclosure, and the use of a link that leads to a website is very well-known in the art, et seq.).

Claims 9 – 16 are essentially the same as claims 1 – 8 except they set forth the limitations as “an apparatus” rather than “a method”, therefore rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claims 1 – 8 rejections.

Claims 17 – 24 are essentially the same as claims 1 – 8 except they set forth the limitations as “an apparatus” rather than “a method”, therefore rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claims 1 – 8 rejections.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sangwoo Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sangwoo Ahn
Patent Examiner
AU 2166

11/29/2006 SW



MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER